

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)

County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: Parcel 44 Development/ Project No. R2013-01647/ Case No(s). ENV201300142

Lead agency name/address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 91020

Contact Person and phone number: Anita Gutierrez, Special Projects Section, (213) 974-4813

Project sponsor's name/address: Pacific Marina Venture c/o Pacific Ocean Management, LLC.
13737 Fiji Way, C10 Marina del Rey, California 90292

Project location: Lease Parcel 44, Marina del Rey, California 90292
APN: 4224 008 901 Thomas Guide: Page 672 B-7 USGS Quad: Venice (T2S, R15W)

Gross Acreage: 17.41 acres (Total), 8.39 acres (Landside), 7.18 acres (Water)

General plan designation: Marina del Rey Specific Plan

Community/Area wide Plan designation: Marina del Rey Specific Plan:

Zoning: Marina del Rey Specific Plan: "Bali Area," Boat Storage (portion of parcel at corner of Admiralty Way and Mindinao Way), Marine Commercial (portion adjacent to Admiralty Way), Visitor-Serving/Convenience Commercial (on mole road portions) and Water with a Waterfront Overlay.

Description of project:

Parcel 44 is a U-shaped site that wraps partially around Basin G of the Marina del Rey small-craft harbor. The parcel consists of a total of 8.39 landside acres and 7.18 waterside (or submerged) acres. There are seven existing structures on the site totaling 14,724 square feet and a paved surface parking lot with 110 boat parking spaces and 383 vehicle parking spaces. The existing landside structures are developed as office space for boat brokers, a boat repair shop, and a yacht club currently. The site provides only a single boaters' bathroom facility.

The proposed project consists of the demolition of all existing landside structures on Parcel 44 and redevelopment of the landside parcel. (The redevelopment of the Parcel 44 anchorage that is located on the waterside portion of the subject parcel is not a part of this project. Development approval for demolition of the existing Parcel 44 anchorage and the subsequent construction of a new private boat anchorage on the waterside portion of the subject parcel has already been granted by the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Coastal Development Permit ("CDP") No. 5-11-131; final issuance of this CDP was given by the Coastal Commission staff on June 26, 2012.)

The following is a description of the proposed new structures on Parcel 44, which total approximately 83,778 square feet of building area.

- Building I (as denoted on the site plan) will serve as boaters' bathrooms with an area of 386 square feet.

- Building II will serve a “Trader Joe’s” (or similar) grocery market of 13,625 square feet.
- Building III (386 square feet) is similar to Building I and will serve as boaters’ bathrooms.
- Building IV is a two-story structure. The ground floor of this building will be occupied entirely by a “West Marine” (or similar) retail store (25,000 square feet). The second floor will contain offices for boat brokers (5,133 square feet), offices to replace existing offices located on the parcel (4,554 square feet), marine administrative offices (6,901 square feet), a community room/lounge (840 square feet) and a boater’s laundry room (542 square feet). Building V will accommodate retail space (4,260 square feet) and a restaurant (2,367 square feet).
- Building VI will contain a two-story, waterfront-oriented restaurant (8,278 square feet) with a prominent “tower” feature to serve as an entry foyer to the restaurant, which will be accessible from Admiralty Way and Bali Way. The first floor of this building will also accommodate commercial retail space (9,270 square feet).
- Building VII will serve as boaters’ bathrooms with an area of 386 square feet.
- Building VIII will accommodate a yacht club (1,150 square feet) and a boat repair shop (700 square feet).

In addition, an open-air boat stacking/rack system will be included on the northwest portion of the project site, along Bali Way, allowing outdoor storage of up to 44 boats (stacked 3-boats-high), along with 13 “mast-up”/small sailboat storage spaces adjacent to the yacht club/boat repair building.

The project proposes 479 on-grade parking spaces on the subject parcel, of which 284 are standard-dimensioned spaces, 11 are accessible spaces and 184 are compact parking spaces. 70 of the parking spaces are in a tandem configuration. The project also proposes 74 bicycle parking spaces. County Code allows a maximum reduction of 25 vehicle parking spaces for this project, given the number of bicycle parking spaces being provided onsite. With the parking reduction the project’s proposed uses require 485 spaces per Code. (Note the Applicant will be filing for a Parking Permit to allow a modest parking reduction for the project and to allow tandem parking parking, in order to provide some flexibility regarding parking configuration and numbers to account for installation of site infrastructure improvements--i.e., transformers, etc.--during construction.) The project also includes development of a waterfront pedestrian promenade along the parcel’s bulkhead and realignment of the Marvin Braude Bike Path to run parallel to the waterfront pedestrian promenade .

Surrounding land uses and setting: The Marina del Rey Hotel is located to the west on the south side and terminous of Bali Way and a vacant office building as well as Burton Chase Park are located to the southwest on Mindanao Way. Office and retail commercial uses are located to the east and southeast on the east side of Admiralty Way. A public parking lot and boat storage lot (to be developed into an expansion of Burton Chase Park) are located directly south of the project on the south side of Mindanao Way. Parcel 44 surrounds Marina Basin “G,” an existing boat anchorage.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California Coastal Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal Commission review would only be required in the event the County's Coastal Development Permit approval for the project is appealed to the Coastal Commission; the Coastal Commission otherwise retains no permitting authority over the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LACO Board of Supervisors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For parcel lease extension documentation approval.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LACO Div. of Building & Safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Building Permit and related approvals.

Major projects in the area:

<i>Project/Case No.</i>	<i>Description and Status</i>
CDP No.: 5-11-131	Parcels 10, 21, 42/43, 44, 47, 48, 49R, 53, 77, 125, EE and BW/9U: California Coastal Commission-approved Coastal Development Permit for "master" waterside anchorage redevelopment authorizing demolition of existing anchorages and construction of new anchorages and facilities appurtenant thereto on the waterside portions of the above-referenced Marina parcels.
R2010-00669/ RENV201000022	Parcels 42 and 43 (APN No. 4224-008-900): Site Plan Review for rehabilitation of the Marina del Rey Hotel, an existing 154-room hotel, and the demolition and subsequent redevelopment of the hotel's private boat anchorage.
R2006-03647/ CDP200600008	Parcel 10R (APN No. 4224-003-900): Approved Coastal Development Permit to authorize the demolition of an existing 136-unit apartment complex and the development of a 400-unit complex.
R2006-03652/ CDP200600009	Parcel 14 (APN No. 4224-003-900): Approved Coastal Development Permit to authorize the demolition of an existing parking lot and the development of a 126-unit apartment complex.
CDP200600007	Parcel 9U, Northern Portion (APN No. 4224-002-900): Pending Coastal Development Permit to authorize the construction of a 288-room hotel with a restaurant and other auxiliary facilities.
R2006-03643/ CDP200600006	Parcel 9U, Southern Portion (APN No. 4224-002-900): Coastal Development Permit to authorize the development of a public wetland and upland park.
R2007-01480/ CDP200700001	Parcels 55, 56 & W (APN No. 4224-011-901): Pending Coastal Development Permit to authorize the demolition of Fisherman's Village and all existing parking, landscaping, and hardscaping, and the development of a new mixed-use commercial plaza and multi-story parking structure.
R2006-01510/ CDP200600002 & CDP 20060003	Parcels 147 & 21 (APN No. 4224-006-900): Coastal Development Permit to authorize the demolition of all existing landside improvements and the construction of a 114 unit senior accommodations facility, 5000 square feet of retail space and other site amenities and facilities; & 447-space parking structure, marine commercial & community park (Parcel 21)
R2009-00924	Parcel 145R (APN No. 4224-006-900): (Interior and exterior renovation of the existing 132-room Marina International Hotel (Under Construction)

R2009-00752
PP201000954

Parcel 64 (APN No. 4224-011-901): Interior and exterior renovation of the existing 224-unit Villa Venetia apartment complex (Under Construction)

R2008-02340/
CDP200800007

Parcels 52R (APN No. 4224-003-900): Coastal Development Permit authorizing a dry stack boat storage facility, with capacity for 345 boats, along with appurtenant office space and customer lounge, 30 mast up storage spaces, parking, and a new Sheriff's Department/Lifeguard Boatwright facility.

Reviewing Agencies: [See CEQA Appendix B to help determine which agencies should review your project]

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ None
Regional Water Quality Control
Board:
☐ Los Angeles Region
☐ Lahontan Region
☐ Coastal Commission
☐ Army Corps of Engineers
☐ City of Culver
☐ Los Angeles City Bureau of
Sanitation

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
☒ Coastal Commission
☐ Santa Monica Mountains
Conservancy
☐ National Parks
☐ National Forest
☐ Edwards Air Force Base
☐ Resource Conservation
District of Santa Monica
Mountains Area
☒ Local Native American Tribe

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
☐ SCAG Criteria
☐ Air Quality
☐ Water Resources
☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
☐ State Dept. of Fish and Game
☐ State Dept. of Parks and
Recreation
☐ State Lands Commission
☐ University of California
(Natural Land and Water
Reserves System)

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ DPW:
- Land Development Division
(Grading & Drainage)
- Geotechnical & Materials
Engineering Division
- Watershed Management
Division (NPDES)
- Traffic and Lighting Division
- Environmental Programs
Division
- Waterworks Division
- Sewer Maintenance Division

- ☒ Fire Department
- Forestry, Environmental
Division
- Planning Division
- Land Development Unit
- Health Hazmat
☒ Sanitation District
☒ Public Health/Environmental
Health Division: Land Use
Program (OWTS), Drinking
Water Program (Private
Wells), Toxics Epidemiology
Program (Noise)
☒ Sheriff Department
☒ Parks and Recreation
☐ Subdivision Committee

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings
of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (Prepared by)

Date

Signature (Approved by)

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (*State CEQA Guidelines* § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on: (1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and (2) worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

1. AESTHETICS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Marina del Rey Specific Plan contains view corridor requirements, which state that, where feasible, a minimum of 20 percent of the water frontage of a site shall be preserved as a view corridor. The project site faces the water along approximately 1,529 linear feet, consisting of 495 feet along Mindanao Way, 600 feet along Admiralty Way, and 434 feet along Bali Way. Based on the 20 percent requirement (which applies when, as here, building heights are kept under 45 feet), the proposed project would be required to provide view corridors totaling approximately 306 feet within the project site.

¹ The proposed project would provide a total of 822 linear feet of view corridor within the project site, which is well in excess of that required by the Marina del Rey Specific Plan for the project (i.e., 306 linear feet). The proposed project would not exceed the height limit allowed in the Marina del Rey Specific Plan as no structure would be over 45 feet. Therefore, while the proposed project would increase the intensity of development within the project site, the project would be consistent with County standards for the preservation and enhancement of scenic marina views. Impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Marvin Braude Bike Path, a Class I Bike Path, crosses the project site southwest of Admiralty Way.² New structures within the project site would be visible from this path. However, project landside development would occur between the bike path and Admiralty way and would thus not obstruct views of the marina from the path (the proposed realignment of the bike path represents a significant public safety and Marina water viewshed enhancement for bikers, as the path currently meanders haphazardly through the parcel's surface parking area along the parcel's Admiralty Way frontage). Class II bike lanes are provided along both Bali Way and Mindanao Way. The proposed project would be visible by bicyclist traveling along these bike lanes. However, view corridors would be provided along both streets to allow for views of the marina. As discussed above under **threshold 1a**, the proposed project would exceed County requirements for view corridors. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The nearest designated state scenic highway is State Route 2 approximately 12 miles northeast of the project site. State Route 1/Lincoln Boulevard, located approximately 200 feet northeast of the project site, is an eligible state scenic highway. However, views of the project site from State Route 1 are obscured by intervening development. The project site is not visible from any designated or eligible state scenic highway,

¹ County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Sec. 22.46.1060

² County of Los Angeles, Bicycle Master Plan.

and impacts would therefore be less than significant.

Source: Caltrans, “Officially Designated State Scenic Highways and Historic Parkways,” http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/index.htm.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features?



The proposed project would increase development intensity within the project site from 14,274 square feet of existing commercial space to approximately 83,778 square feet of visitor-serving and marine commercial space, retail and restaurant uses. Proposed improvements will have the capability of blocking views to the marina. Proposed development would be consistent with the commercial and boat-related character of surrounding development, and would not be expected to degrade the site’s existing visual character; however, further analysis on this topic is warranted in the project EIR. As discussed above under **threshold 1a**, the proposed project would exceed County requirements for view corridors. Impacts would be significant without the provision of view corridors.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?



The new commercial structures proposed within the project site would increase the amount of shadow cast within and beyond the project site. The proposed “West Marine” retail building (Building IV) and the restaurant/retail building oriented to the corner of Bali Way and Admiralty Way (Building VI) would be the only two-story structures included in the proposed project and therefore would be the tallest structures within the project site. Shadows cast by structures within the project site would be cast toward Basin G (west) during morning hours and toward the Admiralty Way (east) during evening hours. The tall commercial structures northeast of the project site across Admiralty Way would not be considered sensitive to increased shadow. Since the structures northeast of the project site are taller than the proposed structures, new shadows cast in the evening hours would be minimal. The project’s shade and shadow impacts are nonetheless considered potentially significant, and additional analysis is thus warranted in the project EIR.

New lighting within the project site would potentially increase the amount of light within the project site and surrounding areas. However, the project site and adjacent parcels currently have security and safety lighting. Project development would result in an incremental increase in light that would not adversely affect nighttime views.

Glare can result from the use of reflective building materials such as metal or glass. While project development would involve the use of such materials, the project does not proposed to use broad expanses of reflective building materials that could potentially create a source of glare that could affect passing motorists. Impacts under this threshold would be less than significant after mitigation and project design features.

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located in an area that is designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation.³ Further analysis regarding this topic is not required.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is located in the County unincorporated community of Marina del Rey, which is designated as Specific Plan Zone as zoned under the County of Los Angeles. Parcel 44's land use designations per the certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) are Marine Commercial, Boat Storage, Visitor-serving/Convenience-commercial and Water with a Waterfront Overlay Zone designation.⁴ The project site does not support and is not zoned for, nor is it located near an area that is zoned for or developed with, forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur to agricultural land uses or conflict with any agricultural zones and further analysis on this topic is not required.

³ California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program
ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/

⁴ County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Land Use Plan.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is located in the County unincorporated community of Marina del Rey, which is designated as Specific Plan Zone as zoned under the County of Los Angeles. Parcel 44's land use designations per the certified LCP are Marine Commercial, Boat Storage, Visitor-serving/Convenience-commercial and Water with a Waterfront Overlay Zone designation.⁵ The project site does not support and is not zoned for, nor is it located near an area that is zoned for or developed with, forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur to agricultural land uses or conflict with any agricultural zones and further analysis on this topic is not required.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is located in the County unincorporated community of Marina del Rey, which is designated as Specific Plan Zone as zoned under the County of Los Angeles. Parcel 44's land use designations per the certified LCP are Marine Commercial, Boat Storage, Visitor-serving/Convenience-commercial and Water with a Waterfront Overlay Zone designation.⁶ The project site does not support and is not zoned for, nor is it located near an area that is zoned for or developed with, forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impacts would occur to agricultural land uses or conflict with any agricultural zones, and further analysis on this topic is not required.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is located in the County unincorporated community of Marina del Rey, which is designated as Specific Plan Zone as zoned under the County of Los Angeles. Parcel 44's land use designations per the certified LCP are Marine Commercial, Boat Storage, Visitor-serving/Convenience-commercial and Water with a Waterfront Overlay Zone designation.⁷ The proposed project site does not contain agricultural farmland nor is it near an area of agricultural farmland. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural land. No further analysis on this topic is required.

⁵ County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Land Use Plan.

⁶ County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Land Use Plan.

⁷ County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Land Use Plan.

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project falls under the jurisdiction of the SCAQMD. In conjunction with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the SCAQMD is responsible for formulating and implementing air pollution control strategies in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was adopted in 2003 and updated in 2007 to establish a comprehensive air pollution control program leading to the attainment of California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in the SCAB. The AQMP also addresses the requirements set forth in the California and Federal Clean Air Acts. Potential impacts on local and regional air quality may exceed SCAQMD thresholds due to construction and operation of the proposed project. Because construction and operation of the project may exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds, the air quality emissions from the proposed project may have a significant impact. Consequently, the proposed project may potentially increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new air quality violations, delay timely attainment of air quality standards, or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP. Based on the above discussion, the proposed project may potentially conflict with applicable regional plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project. Therefore, the proposed project may not be consistent with the AQMP and could have a potentially significant impact with respect to this criterion.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is a redevelopment of Parcel 44 located in the community of Marina Del Rey in unincorporated Los Angeles County. The proposed project would replace 14,724 square feet (sf) of development consisting of office space, boat repair, and a yacht club with 83,778 sf, to include a grocery store, retail and restaurant space, a yacht club, offices, a lounge, a boat repair facility and boat storage uses. The project does not propose the addition of any new dwelling units. The additional square footage of space as part of the proposed project is not expected to exceed the state's criteria for regional significance; however, there is the potential for a significant project impact in this regard, and additional analysis is thus warranted in the project EIR.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?



In 1993, the SCAQMD prepared its *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook* to assist local government agencies and consultants in preparing environmental documents for projects subject to CEQA. The SCAQMD is in the process of developing an Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook to replace the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. While the Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook is being developed, supplemental information has been adopted by the SCAQMD. These include revisions to the air quality significance thresholds and a new procedure referred to as “localized significance thresholds,” which has been added as a significance threshold under the Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.⁸ The applicable portions of the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, the Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook supplemental information, and other revised methodologies were used in preparing the air quality analysis for this section.

Traffic Congestion

The proposed project includes the redevelopment of Parcel 44 with retail and boater-serving land uses in an existing commercial use corridor bounded by Bali Way to the north, Admiralty Way to the east, and Mindanao Way to the south, in Marina Del Rey. The proposed project may result in substantial additional traffic and consequent congestion due to the addition of retail space and other amenities. Additional analysis is warranted in the Project EIR.

CO Hotspots

Traffic congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of carbon monoxide (CO). Localized areas where ambient concentrations exceed the state 1-hour standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour standard of 9.0 ppm are termed CO hotspots. CO is produced in greatest quantities from vehicle combustion and is usually concentrated at or near ground level because it does not readily disperse into the atmosphere. As a result, potential air quality impacts to sensitive receptors are assessed through an analysis of localized CO concentrations. The project would replace 14,724 square feet (sf) of space with 83,778 sf of space which would represent a substantial expansion of its existing facilities, including new retail, restaurant and commercial space. As a result, the project would result in a substantial additional number of vehicle trips and would have the potential to create additional traffic congestion in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project may cause or contribute to CO hotspots and may be potentially significant with respect to this criterion. Additional analysis is warranted in the Project EIR.

Construction Emissions

Construction activities have the potential to cause short-term impacts with respect to air quality standards. According to SCAQMD, project emissions are considered to cause a significant impact to air quality if they would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for the following criteria pollutants: volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), CO, sulfur oxides (SO_x), respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀), and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). The construction emissions associated with the proposed project will be estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). CalEEMod is a program that

⁸ South Coast Air Quality Management District, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, (2008).

calculates air pollutant emissions from land use development projects and incorporates factors specific to the Basin and the SCAQMD, such as VOC content in architectural coating and vehicle fleet mixes.

Site-specific or project-specific data to be used in the CalEEMod model will be provided by the project Applicant including the estimated construction schedule and information. The existing project site contains primarily commercial and retail space, including 584 sf of bathrooms, a 7,844 sf boat brokers' offices and buildings, a 1,080 sf yacht club, a 1,000 sf boat repair and a 4,216 sf office building. These existing uses would all be demolished as part of the proposed project. The proposed project would construct a variety of retail, office, restaurant and marine/boater-serving uses.

Project construction is anticipated to begin in the second quarter 2015 and to be completed by the end of 2016. Construction is anticipated to occur over a period of approximately 18 months. Project construction would include demolition, grading, trenching, building construction, architectural coating, and asphalt paving sub-phases. Due to the type and duration of construction activities, construction emissions from the proposed project may be potentially significant. The EIR will discuss this topic in greater detail.

Operational Emissions

Emissions from operation of the project have the potential to cause long-term impacts with respect to air quality standards. According to SCAQMD, a project's operational emissions are considered to cause a significant impact to air quality if they would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of significance for the following criteria pollutants: VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM10, and PM2.5. Operational emissions would be generated by both mobile and stationary sources as a result of normal day-to-day activities on the project site after occupation. Mobile emissions would be generated by the motor vehicles traveling to, from, and within the project site. Stationary emissions, both point source and area source, would be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices (including water heater and boilers). Given the size and types of development planned for the proposed project, operational emissions have the potential to exceed significance thresholds and may be significant. The EIR will discuss this topic in greater detail.

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD recommends that the potential localized impacts be evaluated on the ambient air concentrations of NO_x, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 due to on-site emissions. The evaluation requires that anticipated ambient air concentrations, determined using a computer based air quality dispersion model, be compared to localized significance thresholds. The thresholds for NO_x and CO represent the allowable increase in concentrations above background levels in the vicinity of the project that would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). The threshold for PM10, which is 10.4 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³), represents compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust). The threshold for PM2.5, which is also 10.4 µg/m³, is intended to constrain emissions to aid in progress toward attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS.

The project site is located in Marina Del Rey, which is in SRA 2 (Northwest Los Angeles County Coastal). The entire project site area including waterside and submerged areas is 17.41 acres. Although the project site is located in a commercial use area, with few sensitive receptors nearby, Burton Chase Park is located adjacent to the project site to the southwest. Therefore, the proposed project has the potential to exceed local significance thresholds and therefore may have a significant impact. The EIR will discuss this topic in greater detail.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☒☐☐☐

According to the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, projects that are within the emission thresholds identified above for construction and operation should be considered less than significant on a cumulative basis, unless there is other pertinent information to the contrary.⁹ As discussed previously, emissions associated with construction and operation of the proposed project may potentially exceed SCAQMD-recommended significance thresholds and may therefore possibly cause an individually significant impact. Since both construction and operation emissions may exceed the thresholds of significance, the proposed project may possibly result in a significant cumulative impact; additional analysis is warranted in the Project EIR.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐☐☒☐

The land uses associated with the proposed project are not expected to cause odor nuisances, dust, and hazardous emissions. Construction of the project is temporary and is not expected to cause an odor nuisance. Refuse associated with operation of the proposed project will continue to be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on air quality with respect to this criterion.

⁹ South Coast Air Quality Management District, *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, (1993) 9–12.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is currently occupied by urbanized, commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots without any common or sensitive natural habitat areas. There are no landside habitat areas that may support any federally or state-listed Endangered or Threatened species, such as the least tern that may occur at Venice Beach or foraging over the marina waters. Since the project site does not have any natural habitat areas that can be affected by project construction or infrastructure improvements, the proposed project is not expected to have a substantial adverse effect to a terrestrial species regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game or the US Fish and Wildlife Service. However, there is a slight possibility that special-status birds may nest in the landscape trees within or adjacent to the project site that may affect the breeding success for those species. Therefore, this topic will be further analyzed in the Project EIR.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is currently occupied by commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots. The project site is urbanized and does not contain any natural habitat areas, sensitive or common. The proposed project is located within the state-designated Coastal Zone but is surrounded on all sides by urban land uses. The project site is not located within a designated Significant Ecological Area (SEA), coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource Area (SERA) or Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). The closest SEA to the project site is the Ballona Creek SEA, located approximately 1 mile southeast of the project site. Because the project site is not located within or adjacent to an SEA or SERA, no impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed project. Impacts associated with sensitive nesting bird species is addressed in **4a**, above. Therefore, no further analysis would be required on this topic with respect to the project.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐☐☒☐

The project site is currently occupied by urbanized, commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots without any common or sensitive natural habitat areas, including wetlands or waters of the United States. Since the project site does not have any natural terrestrial jurisdictional habitat areas that can be affected, removed, or filled by construction, fire clearance, or flood related improvements, there would be no impacts.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☒☐☐☐

The project site is not adjacent to or located in a wildlife corridor, nor is it adjacent to an open space linkage. The above discussion regarding impacts associated with redevelopment of the project site to nesting and roosting birds such as the Great Blue Heron, Black-crowned Night Heron, Double-crested Cormorant, and the Great Egret conclude that there is the potential for impacts to occur. Therefore, this topic will be further discussed in the Project EIR.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, Southern California black walnut, etc.)?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is currently occupied by urbanized, commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots without any natural habitat areas. There are no habitat areas that support oak woodlands and no native trees occur on the project site. Therefore, no oak resources would be impacted and no further analysis is required.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

☒☐☐☐

The project site is currently occupied by urbanized, commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots

without any natural habitat areas. There are no habitat areas that support oak resources on the project site, so the Oak Tree Ordinance would not apply to the proposed project. The project site is not located in or near a Wildflower Reserve Area or a Significant Ecological Area. Although the project site is located within the Coastal Zone and special-status birds may potentially nest in the ornamental trees, a potential impact to nesting birds may occur. Therefore, this topic will be further discussed in the Project EIR.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is currently occupied by urbanized, commercial-retail land uses and surface parking lots without any natural habitat areas. There are no habitat areas that support native biological resources on the project site. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan, as none exist in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with provisions of any habitat conservation plan and no further analysis is required.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not considered a historical site nor does it contain historical structures. The proposed project site does not contain known historic structures and is not considered a historic site according to the Office of Historic Preservation.¹⁰ Furthermore, the Marina del Rey Land Use Plan does not identify any known historical structures or sites within the community of Marina Del Rey. Implementation of the proposed project would not include renovation of a historic structure or historic site. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on historical resources and no further analysis is required.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in an area of Marina del Rey that is currently developed and has been developed for the past 50 years. The project site does not contain known archaeological resources, drainage courses, springs, knolls, rock outcroppings, or oak trees that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity. Demolition and export of underlying soil and debris would take place during the redevelopment process. The closest area containing known archaeological resources is the Ballona Creek Watershed area, approximately 1 mile south from the project site, where remnants of past human activity have been located. Any resources on Marina del Rey land already altered or designated for development have already been impacted. The proposed project would thus have a less than significant impact on archaeological resources and no further analysis is required.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project site is currently developed with commercial structures and surface parking lots. As described above, the proposed project site has been urbanized over the past 50 years and the likelihood of paleontological resources existing under the project site is limited. The proposed project would involve limited excavation on-site with no unique geologic feature. Additionally, the project site is not adjacent to any unique geologic features. Since the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature there would be no impacts. Further analysis on this topic would not be required.

¹⁰ Office of Historic Preservation, California State Parks, California Historical Resources, <http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/listedresources/>; Los Angeles County Local Coastal Program, Marina Del Rey Land Use Plan

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not known to contain any human remains. Furthermore, the proposed project entails minimal excavation and grading as only minor surface grading is proposed. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on human remains and no further analysis is required.

6. ENERGY

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would comply with the County Green Building Ordinance and would be designed in compliance with the County of Los Angeles Green Building Standards. Further, the project would be developed in compliance with all state and local regulations related to energy conservation, and would comply with the County's Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance. Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant and additional analysis is not required.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Project energy use would consist of fuel during the construction of the proposed project and electricity and fuel during project operation. The commercial development proposed would comply with applicable state regulations regarding energy efficiency and would not be expected to use extraordinary amounts of energy or to involve inefficient use of energy resources.¹¹ Therefore, project impacts would be less than significant and additional analysis is not required.

¹¹ California Energy Commission, 2008 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, 2010.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.¹² The Marina del Rey Specific Plan, which applies to the proposed project, requires that all projects within the specific plan area provide a comprehensive geologic and soils analysis to identify and delineate areas of potential seismic hazard, and to provide adequate mitigation for such hazards. Since the project site is not identified as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

As discussed under **threshold 7a(i)**, above, the project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.¹³ The project site is located in a seismically active region, and would be subjected to ground shaking during future seismic events. The Charnock Fault and Overland Fault, which lie respectively 2.75 miles and 5.5 miles to the east of Marina del Rey, are part of the major Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone¹⁴. The Santa Monica Fault lies about 4.4 miles from the project site¹⁵. Furthermore, the Malibu Coast Fault lies approximately 7 miles to the northwest of Marina del Rey and is considered a potentially active fault. Both of these faults are capable of producing earthquakes up to a magnitude of 7.0.

The Marina del Rey Specific Plan, which applies to the proposed project, requires that all new construction use earthquake-resistant construction and engineering practices.. Implementation of these requirements and seismic safety standards provided in the California Building Code, as enforced by the County Department of Public Works (DPW), would reduce the potential adverse effects of seismic ground shaking to less than significant.

¹² California Department of Conservation, "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones," <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/index.aspx>; County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Sec. 22.46.1180.

¹³ California Department of Conservation, "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones," <http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/index.aspx>; County of Los Angeles, Marina del Rey Specific Plan, Sec. 22.46.1180.

**iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including
liquefaction and lateral spreading?**

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

The proposed project is an urban infill development that would increase the intensity of development on a currently developed site. The proposed project site is located in an area that has been designated as a liquefiable area.¹⁶ Furthermore, the proposed project is located within an area having a high groundwater level.¹⁷ Site-specific geotechnical studies would be required for new development under the Marina del Rey Specific Plan and DPW's geotechnical and seismic review procedures (see discussion under **threshold 7a[ii]**, above). Should the geotechnical study identify any potential for seismic-related ground failure, development in areas subject to such hazards would be prohibited unless adequate mitigation is identified and implemented. Additional analysis of potential seismic hazards associated with the project, and mitigation measures intended to reduce such impacts to a level of insignificance, is warranted in the Project EIR.

iv) Landslides?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project site is located on land that is topographically flat. There are no hills, mounds, or mountains located on the proposed project site. Furthermore, the surrounding area of the project site is topographically flat as well. The proposed project is not located in an area containing a major landslide; therefore, there would be no impacts, and no further analysis would be required.

**b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of
topsoil?**

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project site is located on land that is topographically flat. There are no hills, mounds, or mountains located on the proposed project site. Furthermore, the surrounding area of the project site is topographically flat. The proposed project is currently developed with a surface parking lot, and commercial retail structures. An adequate drainage system currently exists on the project site. Since the project site is currently developed with non-permeable surfaces and would remain so developed with implementation of the proposed project, the project site would not be subject to high erosion. Because the proposed project is not located in an area containing easily erodible soil, there would be no impacts, and no further analysis would be required. Moreover, the applicant will be required to comply with all applicable National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Service (NPDES) and low-impact development building requirements affecting site drainage to the satisfaction of LA County Division of Building & Safety.

**c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is
unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of
the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site
landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction
or collapse?**

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

-
- ¹⁴ County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, Marina Del Rey Land Use Plan, February 9, 1996, pg. 10-1.
- ¹⁵ Group Delta Consultants. Geotechnical Engineering Report, Proposed Commercial and Retail Development, Marina del Rey – Parcel 44. June 1, 2012.
- ¹⁶ County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles General Plan, Safety Element, Plate 4, Liquefaction Susceptibility.
- ¹⁷ County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles General Plan, Safety Element, Plate 3, Shallow and Perched Groundwater.

See discussion under **threshold 7a(iii)**, above.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☒☐☐☐

See discussion under **threshold 7a(iii)**, above.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐☐☐☒

No on-site wastewater treatment systems such as septic systems are proposed as part of the project. Therefore no further consideration of this issue is needed.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

☐☐☐☒

The proposed project site is not located in a designated hillside management area. Therefore, no impact would occur.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Construction of the proposed project would result in one-time emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs). These emissions, primarily carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O), are the result of fuel combustion by construction equipment and motor vehicles. The other primary GHGs (hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) are typically associated with specific industrial sources and are not expected to be emitted by the proposed project. The project's GHG emissions were estimated using CalEEMod using the same parameters for criteria pollutants.

The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction-related GHG emissions over a project's lifetime in order to include these emissions as part of a project's annualized lifetime total emissions, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies. The SCAQMD has defined a project lifetime to be a 30-year period. In accordance with this methodology, the project's construction GHG emissions have been amortized over a 30-year period.

At full buildout, the project would result in direct annual emissions of GHGs during project operation. These emissions, primarily CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, are the result of fuel combustion from building heating systems and motor vehicles. Building and motor vehicle air conditioning systems may use hydrofluorocarbons (and hydrochlorofluorocarbons and chlorofluorocarbons to the extent that they have not been completely phased out at later dates).

The SCAQMD has not yet formally adopted significance thresholds for emissions of GHG. However, a SCAQMD working group has produced draft guidance that includes proposed significance thresholds for land use projects. The draft threshold applicable for mixed-use or all land use projects is 3,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents per year (MTCO₂e/year).

It is generally the case that an individual project is of insufficient magnitude by itself to influence climate change or result in a substantial contribution to the global GHG inventory.¹⁸ GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts; there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective.¹⁹ The proposed project includes a mix of retail and commercial land uses. As these types of land uses often result in increased traffic and substantial energy use, there is likely to be an associated substantial increase in GHG emissions from the site. These increased emissions may exceed the SCAQMD draft significance thresholds for GHG emissions. Therefore, the project may potentially have a significant impact on GHG emissions. The EIR will discuss this topic in greater detail.

¹⁸ California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, (2008) 35.

¹⁹ Ibid.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?



On January 16, 2007, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors instructed the Directors of Regional Planning and Public Works to create a green building program that would incorporate green building standards into all appropriate industrial, commercial, and residential development Projects within all unincorporated areas of the County. The green building program was approved by the Board on November 18, 2008 and became effective on January 1, 2009. However, the green building program applies to new buildings or first-time tenant improvements greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet. The Green Building Technical Manual²⁰ describes that the program would require non-residential projects greater than 10,000 to meet certain minimum standards.

The low impact development (LID) ordinance requires the use of LID principles in development projects. LID encourages site sustainability and smart growth in a manner that respects and preserves the characteristics of the County's watersheds, drainage paths, water supplies, and natural resources. Non-residential projects that alter less than 50 percent of the existing impervious surface must comply with LID best management practices that promote infiltration and beneficial use of stormwater runoff for the altered portion. If greater than 50 percent of the existing impervious surface is altered, the entire site must comply with LID best management practices.

The drought-tolerant landscaping ordinance establishes minimum standards for the design and installation of landscaping using drought-tolerant and native plants that require minimal use of water. The requirements ensures that the County conserves water resources by requiring landscaping that is appropriate to the region's climate and nature of the use. Projects consisting of new non-residential buildings or first-time tenant improvements greater than or equal to 10,000 square feet shall use drought-tolerant plants for at least 75 percent of all landscaping and require that all turf be water-efficient and limited to 25 percent of all landscaped area not to exceed 5,000 square feet (minimum of 5 feet width for all turf areas).

The proposed project is required to comply with the County of Los Angeles green building, LID, and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances. Therefore, the new buildings will be constructed to exceed Title 24 (2005) by at least 15 percent and meet LEED certification or equivalent. The project will incorporate features in the project design to ensure that the project reduces GHG emissions consistent with the County of Los Angeles green building, LID, and drought-tolerant landscaping ordinances. However, specific project features to be included in the proposed project that will enable this compliance are not currently available. Consequently, there is the possibility that the proposed project may conflict with plans to reduce GHG emissions. The EIR will discuss this topic in greater detail.

²⁰ County of Los Angeles. Draft Green Building Technical Manual. 2011.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The development proposed under the project would not require the routine use of acutely hazardous materials. Typical hazardous materials that would be expected to be used on the project site would include cleaning products associated with the retail, commercial and restaurant portions of the site and fuel for boats within the marina. The proposed project does not include provisions for storage of large quantities of boat fuel on-site. While some hazardous materials would be present within the project site, the proposed project would not be expected to create a significant hazard related to such materials.. For example, paint, solvents and cleaners may used in conjunction with the proposed boat repair shop; however, any unused paint, solvents or cleaners would be disposed of in conformance with applicable regulations and the spent cans recycled. Impacts would thus be less than significant and additional analysis is not warranted.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project could use hazardous materials such as paints, cleaning agents, aerosol cans, landscaping-related chemicals, and common household substances such as bleaches during construction and renovation activities on the project site, as well as during operation of the uses on the project site upon buildout. All uses and storage of these materials would be subject to federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of these hazardous materials. Most of the hazardous materials indicated above are allowed to be disposed of at the local Class II and Class III landfills that serve the proposed project site and community of Marina del Rey. Since the proposed project would be required to abide by federal, state, and local laws pertaining to the use, storage, and transportation of these materials, the likelihood of an accidental release occurring and creating a significant hazard to the public would be minimal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No further analysis is required on this topic.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located within 0.25 mile of sensitive land uses; however, the proposed project would not include the storage of large quantities of hazardous materials or pressurized tanks. Consequently, there would be less than significant impacts. Further analysis on this topic is not required.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located on a parcel of land that has been included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5²¹. The closest site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites is located at 4144 Glencoe Avenue, approximately 0.5 mile north of the project site. Since the proposed project site is not located on a site that is listed as a hazardous materials site, there would be no impacts. Further analysis on this topic would not be required.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is located approximately 2.2 miles to the northwest of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and approximately 1.9 miles south of the Santa Monica Airport. The project site is not located within 2 miles of LAX, is not located within the Santa Monica Airport Influence Area,²² is not located in the LAX Airport Influence Area,²³ and would not result in a safety hazard for people in the project area. No impacts would occur and further analysis on this topic would not be required.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

There are no private airstrips in the project site vicinity and no safety hazard impact would occur. Further analysis is not required.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is located in Marina del Rey, which is an unincorporated portion of the County of Los Angeles. The project site would be subject to the Operational Area Emergency Response Plan (the OAERP), which is prepared by the Office of Emergency Management.²⁴ Implementation of the proposed project would not change current evacuation routes from off the project site. Furthermore, development of the proposed project would not physically interfere with the OAERP. No impacts would occur and further analysis on this topic is not required.

²¹ California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor Database

²² Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, Santa Monica Airport Influence Area, http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-santa-monica.pdf.

²³ Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, LAX Airport Influence Area, http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-lax.pdf.

²⁴ Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, Draft General Plan 2008, Safety Element, pg. 176.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Therefore, the project would have no impact on fire safety.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not located in a high fire hazard zone and there is adequate emergency access. In addition, a fire lane is a component of the proposed project. Therefore, the project would have no impact on fire safety.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?

☐☐☒☐

The proposed project will be required to meet all fire safety requirements including the need to provide adequate fire flow in the event of a fire hazard; adequate fire flows for the project will be required to be demonstrated by the applicant prior to issuance of project building permits. There would be a less than significant impact from the project to fire safety in regard to fire flow.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not located in proximity to land uses with the potential for dangerous fire hazard. The project site is surrounded by primarily residential and office commercial land uses. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact with respect to its proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard; no further analysis on this topic is warranted.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

☐☐☒☐

The project consists of commercial retail and boater-serving development, the majority of which would not constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard. The project plans will be reviewed by Fire Department staff during the application review process and project design features, if necessary, will be incorporated into the plans, prior to their approval by the County, to mitigate potential fire hazards. Therefore, the proposed project will result in less than significant impacts related to a potentially dangerous fire hazard.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Compliance with the County Department of Public Works–administered NPDES/MS4 permit would ensure that construction runoff does not exceed discharge requirements. A detailed drainage plan and study will be required to analyze potential runoff from the project site during operation. These plans will be further discussed in the EIR for the proposed project.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is currently paved and developed with commercial structures and paved parking and storage areas, and the site, therefore, offers limited opportunities for groundwater recharge. The project does not propose any extraction of groundwater and therefore the proposed project would not cause any impacts to groundwater resources or to groundwater recharge. Further analysis on this topic is not required.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Compliance with the County Department of Public Works–administered NPDES/MS4 permit would ensure that construction runoff does not exceed discharge requirements. A detailed drainage plan and study will be required to analyze potential runoff from the project site during operation.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project site contains an existing drainage system that is adequate in terms of capacity but requires upgrading in regards to modern stormwater management and the County's Low Impact Development (LID) Program. For this reason, it is anticipated that drainage patterns and runoff quantities of the project site would remain substantially the same size as under current conditions, with the addition of a belt of bio-retentive grasscrete and gravel sub base for proper treatment of stormwater runoff. Runoff would continue to outlet through the storm drain system after such treatment. The aforementioned

stormwater management improvements would not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area and would only be introduced to treat and retain runoff in compliance with the County's LID Program. The project's conformance with the County's LID drainage requirements will ensure that site drainage impacts will be mitigated in accordance with the County's most current standards.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The project site is currently developed with commercial structures and paved parking and storage areas. The proposed project would have the same or less runoff entering the stormwater drainage system as the current site condition. However, a detailed drainage plan and study will be required to analyze potential runoff from the project site during operation.

f) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The project site is currently developed with commercial structures and paved parking and storage areas. Compliance with the County Department of Public Works-administered NPDES/MS4 permit would ensure that construction runoff does not exceed discharge requirements. A detailed drainage plan and study will be required to analyze potential runoff from the project site during operation.

g) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project site contains an existing drainage system that is adequate in terms of capacity but requires upgrading in regards to modern stormwater management and the County's Low Impact Development (LID) Program. For this reason, it is anticipated that drainage patterns and runoff quantities of the project site would remain substantially the same size as under current conditions with a gravel sub base for proper treatment of stormwater runoff. Runoff would continue to outlet through the storm drain after such treatment. The aforementioned stormwater management improvements would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area and would only be introduced to treat and retain runoff in compliance with the County's LID Program. Compliance with the LID requirements will be achieved through the implementation of the Drainage Concept, approved by Department of Public Works preceding the issuance of any project grading or building permits.

h) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The Marina basin and, therefore, the project site is not located within an area designated as an Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS).²⁵ Therefore, the proposed project would not impact an ASBS. No further analysis is required.

²⁵ State Water Resources Control Board, *State Water Quality Protection Areas of Special Biological Significance*, http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/ocean/asbs_areas.shtml

i) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

☐☐☐☒

The proposed project would not provide on-site wastewater treatment facilities. No further study of this issue would be necessary.

j) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐☒☐☐

The project site is currently an urbanized development with commercial buildings and surface parking and storage areas. Compliance with the County Department of Public Works—administered NPDES/MS4 permit would ensure that construction runoff does not exceed discharge requirements. A detailed drainage plan and study will be required to analyze potential runoff from the project site during operation.

k) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

☐☐☐☒

The project is not located within a floodway, floodplain, or other flood hazard area. Moreover, the proposed project contains no housing component. Therefore, the project would create no impacts with respect to this topic area and no further analysis is required.

l) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not located within a floodway, floodplain, or other flood hazard area and no structures would be placed within a floodway, floodplain, or other flood hazard area. Therefore, the project would create no impacts with respect to this topic area and no further analysis is required.

m) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐☐☐☒

The project site is not located within a floodway, floodplain, or other flood hazard area and no structures would be placed within a floodway, floodplain, or other flood hazard area. Moreover, the subject property is not located within the flood inundation area of any dam or levee that could potentially fail. Therefore, the project would create no impacts with respect to this topic area and no further analysis is required.

n) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?



The proposed project would not be subject to hazards from mudflow or seiche. The proposed project is located within the Marina del Rey Harbor, along the Southern California coastline. The potential exists for communities along low-lying areas of the Southern California coastline to experience flooding due to tsunamis caused by earthquakes or underwater landslides. The maximum expected run-up of a tsunami in the local area of the project site is 9.6 feet in a 100-year interval and 15.3 feet in a 500-year interval.²⁶ Tsunamis generated from local earthquakes may be larger than distant earthquakes but are less likely to occur. Potential tsunami hazards will require further evaluation in the EIR.

²⁶ County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning, Marina del Rey Land Use Plan, February 9, 1996, pg. 10-4.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is located in an area of Marina del Rey that is highly urbanized. Existing residential structures, commercial structures, parking lots, and parks are located around the proposed project site. The proposed project would not divide an established community; therefore, there would be no impacts. No further analysis on this topic is required.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The project site is designated as “Marine Commercial,” “Visitor-Serving/Convenience Commercial,” “Boat Storage, with Waterfront Overlay,” and “Water” in the Marina del Rey Specific Plan Land Use Plan. The proposed redevelopment of the existing commercial structures and storage areas with new commercial retail and boater-serving services is consistent with the applicable Specific Plan land use designations and development standards for project site. There would be no impact. No further analysis on this topic is required.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The proposed project is zoned as Marina del Rey Specific Plan under the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance. Furthermore, the Marina del Rey Land Use Plan designates the project as “Marine Commercial,” “Visitor-Serving/Convenience Commercial,” “Boat Storage” and “Water” with the “Waterfront Overlay Zone” designation. Per the controlling Marina del Rey Local Coastal Program (of which the Specific Plan and Land Use Plan are a part), the subject property is zoned for the development of the project’s proposed visitor-serving/convenience commercial, marine commercial and boat storage uses. As such, the proposed project would not be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property. There would be no impact. No further analysis on this topic is required.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

☐
☐
☐
☒

The proposed project is not located within an area subject to Hillside Management policies or within a Significant Ecological Area. Project development would therefore not conflict with policies or criteria of such programs. There would be no impact. No further analysis on this topic is required.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone as mapped by the County of Los Angeles.²⁷ The proposed project would not impact a known mineral resource area and no further analysis is required.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is not located within a Mineral Resource Zone as mapped by the County of Los Angeles. However, the project site is located within an Oil and Gas Resource Zone.²⁸ The project site is developed with commercial-retail land uses and does not currently contain existing drilling sites for the recovery of oil and natural gas, nor are any drilling sites located on the project site for the recovery of oil or natural gas proposed in the future. There would be no impacts to oil and natural gas resources with implementation of the proposed project. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated within the County of Los Angeles General Plan or the Marina del Rey Specific Plan. No further analysis is required.

²⁷ County of Los Angeles Draft General Plan, Chapter 6 Conservation and Open Spaces Element, Figure 6.5, Natural Resource Areas, 2008.

²⁸ County of Los Angeles Draft General Plan, Chapter 6 Conservation and Open Spaces Element, Figure 6.5, Natural Resource Areas, 2008.

13. NOISE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Marina del Rey, a highly urbanized area that is within the Marina del Rey Specific Plan area pursuant to the County of Los Angeles Zoning Code. Noise monitoring over a 24-hour period will be conducted at three different locations to measure ambient noise levels for analysis of both construction and operational impacts on nearby sensitive noise receptors (e.g., Burton Chase Park). This topic will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project is not considered a sensitive use and the closest sensitive use is Burton W. Chase Park at the end of Mindanao Way. Because pile driving may occur with the construction of proposed structures, sensitive uses may be exposed to excessive ground vibration and/or groundborne noise levels. Impacts associated with ground vibration and groundborne noise will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project would increase the intensity of the land uses on the project site when compared to existing conditions. The project would construct new commercial structures to replace the existing seven buildings on the site and would result in an increase from 14,724 square feet to approximately 83,778 square feet. The proposed project would not include any new substantial sources of stationary noise, such as an amplified outdoor sound system. Ambient noise level upon completion of the redevelopment of the commercial, retail and restaurant use, and surface parking would not be substantially increased during project operation. The project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to this topic area and no additional analysis is thus required.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Construction activities would include demolition, grading, building construction, paving, and potentially pile driving. During demolition and grading activities, equipment such as backhoes, a grader, a loader, a scraper would be used. Building construction would use a crane and forklift. Paving activities would use a paver and

roller. Off-highway trucks would also be used to transport materials to the site. The loudest expected noise level that at the nearest sensitive receptors would experience during the redevelopment phases could be greater than 80 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) Equivalent Continuous Sound Level (Leq), which is the standard for sensitive land uses. Temporary noise impacts from construction will be analyzed in the EIR.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located within the Los Angeles International Airport or Santa Monica Airport land use plan and would not expose people to excessive noise levels. The project would have no impact related to airport noise.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project site is not located adjacent or near a private airstrip and would not expose receptors to excessive noise levels. The project would have no impact related to noise from a private airstrip. .

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project: a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Infrastructure, such as sewage disposal, roads, water conveyance systems, natural gas lines, and electrical lines, currently exist and serve the project site. Installation of new infrastructure systems would not be required with implementation of the proposed project, though some improvements to the existing infrastructure systems serving the site (e.g., roadways, sewer lines, water lines) may be required. Given the relatively minor size of the proposed development (net gain of approximately 69,054 sq. ft. of new commercial, retail and restaurant space), the proposed project is not anticipated to induce substantial direct or indirect population growth within the community of Marina del Rey. There would be less than significant impacts and further analysis on this topic is not warranted.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No residential development is currently present within the project site and none is proposed for development under the proposed project. As no housing would be displaced, no further analysis of this topic is required.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No residential development is currently present within the project site and none is proposed for development under the proposed project. As no existing residents would be displaced, no further analysis of this topic is required.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The proposed project is the redevelopment of an existing commercial and boat storage complex. No residential land use component is proposed. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed official regional or local population projections and there would be no impacts. Additional analysis on this topic is not required.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

The project site is located in the urbanized area of Marina del Rey. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be standard during demolition and construction of the commercial buildings to ensure that the threat for fire and the threat of crime (pilferage of the construction equipment) is reduced or does not occur on the project site. The proposed project would not result in population growth, and therefore is not expected to substantially affect the ability of existing fire protection resources to meet established standards for service levels. The nearest County Fire Station (#110), located at 4433 Admiralty Way, to the project site is 0.4 mile away. This topic will be further analyzed in the Project EIR.

Sheriff protection?

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

As discussed under **threshold 15a**, above, the proposed project would not result in population growth, and therefore is not expected to substantially affect the ability of existing sheriff protection resources to meet established standards for service levels. The nearest County Sheriff's Station, located at 13851 Fiji Way, to the project site is 1.0 mile away. However, further analysis of this issue will be provided in the Project EIR.

Schools?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

As discussed under **threshold 15a**, above, the proposed project would not result in population growth, and therefore would not substantially affect the ability of existing schools to meet established standards for service levels. No further analysis of this issue is required.

Parks?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

As discussed under **threshold 15a**, above, the proposed project would not result in population growth, and therefore is not expected to substantially affect the ability of existing recreational facilities to meet established standards for service levels. No further analysis of this issue is required.

Libraries?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

As discussed under **threshold 15a**, above, the proposed project would not result in population growth, and therefore would not substantially affect the ability of existing library resources to meet established standards for service levels. No further analysis of this issue is required.

Other public facilities?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

There are no other public services in the project area that would be impacted by the proposed project.

16. RECREATION

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The existing commercial structures do not currently include recreational features for visitors. The Marvin Braude Bike Path, a Class I facility, currently meanders through existing surface parking areas on the project site southwest of Admiralty Way. As discussed above, the project will relocate this bike path along the Admiralty Way-fronting bulkhead, which will be a significant improvement to the existing condition by providing a straight alignment for the bike path along the waterfront. The project also includes development of an expansive public pedestrian promenade along the parcel's bulkhead, whereas the existing developed parcel lacks such a recreational amenity. Further, the proposed project will include recreational amenities associated with the bike path, including bicycle parking. As discussed under **threshold 15a**, above, the proposed project would not result in population increases and is thus not expected to increase the use of existing recreational resources. No further analysis of this issue is required.

b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project does not include the development of any neighborhood or regional park facilities. As discussed above under threshold 16a above, the project includes improvements to the existing bike path. These improvements are limited to the relocation of the existing bike path and would not result in an adverse effect on the environment. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and further analysis on this topic area is not required.

c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The Marvin Braude Bike Path, a Class I facility, crosses the project site southwest of Admiralty Way. However, as discussed under threshold 16a, the improvements would generally be limited to the area between Admiralty Way and the bike path. The bike path would be maintained on-site; however, the path's alignment on the site would be substantially improved as the bike path would be realigned in a straight line through the site and would no longer meander through the parking lot, thereby improving safety. Further, the proposed project includes bicycle parking and pedestrian amenities that would encourage and enhance public use of the subject property. Therefore the proposed project would not interfere with regional open space connectivity, but, rather, would improve such connectivity; impacts would be less than significant and additional analysis of this impact area is not warranted.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project site is currently served by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and Culver Citybus that provides alternative transportation throughout the community of Marina del Rey and into parts of the Los Angeles Metro Region. Redevelopment of the existing commercial structures and surface parking and storage areas would not interfere with alternative transportation service as provided by Metro and Culver Citybus. Since implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, there would be no impact. However, a comprehensive traffic study will be prepared to assess the project's impacts on the local and sub-regional transportation circulation systems, identify potential significant impacts to these systems, and assign traffic system improvements intended to mitigate the project's significant transportation circulation impacts, if any, to the extent feasible. As such, additional analysis on this topic will be provided in the Project EIR.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The CMP requires that detailed analyses be conducted for any arterial monitoring intersections where the proposed project is anticipated to add 50 or more total trips, or for freeway mainline segments where the proposed project is anticipated to add 150 or more trips (per direction) during either the weekday AM or PM peak hours. The current CMP (2010) identifies eight arterial monitoring intersections within approximately 3 miles of the project site. Six of the eight CMP intersections are located within the City of Los Angeles, while one intersection is located within the City of Santa Monica and the remaining intersection is located within the City of Culver City. The CMP arterial monitoring locations are listed below.

- Lincoln Boulevard and Venice Boulevard (Los Angeles)
- Lincoln Boulevard and the Marina Expressway (SR-90) (Los Angeles)
- Lincoln Boulevard and Manchester Avenue (Los Angeles)

- Lincoln Boulevard and Sepulveda Boulevard (Los Angeles)
- Lincoln Boulevard and Pico Boulevard (Santa Monica)
- Venice Boulevard and Centinela Avenue (Los Angeles)
- Venice Boulevard and Overland Avenue (Culver City)
- Manchester Avenue and Sepulveda Boulevard (Los Angeles)

Additionally, the CMP identifies the I-405 (San Diego) Freeway in the project vicinity (specifically between La Tijera Boulevard and the I-10 (Santa Monica) Freeway) as a monitored facility. A complete list of study intersections for detailed analyses of project impacts, including, but not limited to the CMP arterial monitoring locations noted above, will be determined through consultation with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Traffic & Lighting Division. A review of the project's anticipated traffic travel patterns into, out of, and through the study vicinity indicates that project traffic will disperse throughout the area roadway network outside the immediate study vicinity, and that project traffic volume additions to any of the CMP monitoring intersections are expected to be substantially less than the 50-trip threshold and that project-related traffic additions to the subject freeway mainline segments will also be less than the 150-trip threshold. However, additional analysis on this topic will be provided in the Project EIR.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project would not change any air traffic patterns and there would be no impact.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

A comprehensive traffic study will be prepared to assess the project's impacts on the roadways and road intersections in the vicinity of the project site, identify potential significant impacts to these roadways and road intersections, and assign roadway and intersection improvements intended to mitigate the project's significant impacts to analyzed roadways and road intersections, if any, to the extent feasible. Additional analysis on this topic will be provided in the Project EIR.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

The proposed project is not anticipated to create a significant impact to emergency access, either on-site or off-site; however, additional analysis on this topic will be provided in the Project EIR.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposed project will not interfere with existing Bikeway Plan, Pedestrian Plan, Transit Oriented District development standards in the County General Plan Mobility Element. As noted above, the Marvin Braude Bike Path, a Class I facility, currently meanders through existing surface parking areas on the project site southwest of Admiralty Way. The project will relocate this bike path along the Admiralty Way-fronting bulkhead, which will be a significant improvement to the existing condition by providing a straight alignment for the bike path along the waterfront. The proposed project also includes bicycle parking.

Therefore, project impacts will be less than significant.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The increased development intensity within the project site as a result of the proposed project would increase the amount of wastewater discharged from the site using existing wastewater conveyance lines and treatment facilities. Additional study of the potential for the project to exceed wastewater treatment requirements will be provided in the Project EIR.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The increased development intensity within the project site as a result of the proposed project would increase the amount of wastewater discharged from the site using existing wastewater conveyance lines and treatment facilities. Additional study of the potential for the project to exceed wastewater treatment capacity will be provided in the Project EIR.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project is currently covered with impermeable surfaces such as commercial structures and paved parking lots. Project compliance with County requirements for LID design features (see discussion under **threshold 10d**, above) is expected to result in an increase of permeable surfaces within the project site, reducing the amount of stormwater exiting the site. This topic will be further analyzed in the Project EIR.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project site is located in a developed area of Marina del Rey that is currently served by an existing water conveyance system. The increased commercial density proposed for the project site would result in an increase in water demand at project buildout. Additional study of this topic is warranted and will be provided in the Project EIR.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?



The project site currently receives electricity from the Southern California Edison Company and natural gas from the Southern California Gas Company. Infrastructure currently exists on the project site, which conveys an adequate supply of electricity and natural gas to the existing uses on the project site. Project development will result in an increase of building square footage and therefore the proposed project would demand more electricity and natural gas that is currently being demanded under existing conditions. Further analysis on this topic will be provided in the Project EIR.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?



During project demolition, construction, and redevelopment activities, an increase in the amount of construction debris would occur; however, this increase would be temporary in nature and would be able to be accommodated by the local solid waste disposal service provided in the community of Marina del Rey. Furthermore, any debris that would be generated by the proposed project would be subject to the required diversion rate. Operation of the proposed project could result in a potential impact to solid waste disposal facilities, and further analysis of this issue will therefore be provided in the Project EIR.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?



The proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statutes regulating solid waste. While the proposed project would result in an increase in solid waste disposal, the proposed project would comply with solid waste diversion programs for construction and operational solid waste. No further analysis of this issue is required.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Based on the findings of this initial study, the proposed project is not expected to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory. The proposed project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, nor threaten a plant or animal community. Some potential exists for the proposed project to impact nesting birds such as the Great Blue Heron, Black-crowned Night Heron, Double-crested Cormorant, and Great Egret, to the extent these species might happen to establish nests on the site. These topic areas will be further evaluated in the Project EIR.

b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

☐

 ☐

 ☒

 ☐

The proposed project would not disadvantage any long-term environmental goals of Los Angeles County or those identified in the Marina del Rey 2010 Conservation and Management Plan in an effort to achieve short-term environmental goals, as both goals are consistent with each other. Moreover, by incorporating state-of-the-industry water quality protection measures and Green Building standards (as will be required for the project under the County's applicable Low-Impact Development and Green Building ordinances), the project's short-term environmental protection and sustainability components will help to fulfill the County's longer-term environmental protection and sustainability goals.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?

☒☐☐☐

("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

As described throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would increase the current land use intensity on the project site. Related projects as specified above would be involved in individual environmental review to determine the level of significance for impacts pertaining to each of their individual development. Therefore, cumulative impacts could be significant and the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative project impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☒☐☐☐

As described throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project includes the redevelopment of the existing commercial and marine-related facilities and the associated surface parking lot on the project site. The proposed project is not anticipated to include construction or operational activities that would cause a substantial adverse effect on human beings. However, the Project EIR will provide additional analysis on various environmental impact areas identified for further study in this Initial Study, to confirm whether any such impacts will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.